

1 **COMP**

2 PUOY K. PREMSRIRUT, Esq.
3 Nevada Bar No. 007141
4 BROWN BROWN & PREMSRIRUT
5 520 S. Fourth Street, Second Floor
6 Las Vegas, NV 89101
7 Telephone: 702.384.5563
8 Facsimile: 702.385.1752
9 puoy@brownlawlv.com

10 BRUNO W. TARABICHI,
11 CA Bar No. 215129
12 OWENS TARABICHI LLP
13 111 N. Market St., Suite 730
14 San Jose, California 95113
15 Telephone: 408.298.8200
16 Facsimile: 408.521.2203
17 btarabichi@owenstarabichi.com
18 Pro Hac Vice Application Pending
19 Attorneys for Plaintiff
20 Russell Road Food and Beverage, LLC

21 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

22 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

23 RUSSELL ROAD FOOD AND
24 BEVERAGE, LLC, a Nevada limited liability
25 company

26 Case No.

27 Plaintiff,

28 vs.

29 FRANK SPENCER, an individual; CRAZY
30 HORSE CONSULTING, INC., an Ohio
31 corporation; and DOES 1 – 50, inclusive,

32 Defendants.

33 **PLAINTIFF RUSSELL ROAD FOOD AND
34 BEVERAGE, LLC'S COMPLAINT FOR
35 DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF NON-
36 INFRINGEMENT OF TRADEMARK,
37 UNENFORCEABILITY OF TRADEMARK,
38 AND INVALIDITY OF U.S. TRADEMARK
39 APPLICATION SERIAL NOS. 77/557,722
40 AND 85/217,717, AND CANCELLATION OF
41 U.S. TRADEMARK REGISTRATION NO.
42 3,044,028**

43 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

44 Plaintiff Russell Road Food and Beverage, LLC ("Russell Road" or "Plaintiff"), by its
45 attorneys, for its Complaint in this action alleges:

PARTIES

1 1. Russell Road is a Nevada limited liability company having its principal place of
2 business at 3550 West Quail Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada 89118.

3 2. Defendant Frank Spencer is an individual with a business address at 1474 St.
4 Clair Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio 44114. Frank Spencer is the President and sole owner of
5 Defendant Crazy Horse Consulting, Inc. ("Crazy Horse Consulting").
6

7 3. Crazy Horse Consulting is an Ohio corporation having its principal place of
8 business at 2125 Gloucester Road, Lyndhurst, Ohio 44124.
9

10 4. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names of the other Defendants sued herein as Does
11 1 – 50, inclusive, and therefore, sues these Doe Defendants by such fictitious names. Additional
12 Doe Defendants are likely to include, among others, companies owned or associated with Frank
13 Spencer and/or Crazy Horse Consulting to the extent such companies own or claim to own any
14 relevant trademark rights. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to allege their true names and
15 capacities when ascertained.
16

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

17 5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction of this action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331,
18 1332, 1338(a), 2201, 2202, and 15 U.S.C. § 1121, as this action involves substantial claims
19 arising under the U.S. Trademark Act of 1946, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 1051 *et seq.*
20

21 6. Defendants Frank Spencer and Crazy Horse Consulting are subject to personal
22 jurisdiction in this district because Defendants conduct substantial, continuous, and systematic
23 activities in this judicial district and because Plaintiff's causes of action contained herein arise
24 out of or result from Defendants' contacts with this judicial district.
25

26 7. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because a
27 substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in this judicial
28 district.
29

FACTS RELEVANT TO ALL CLAIMS

The Origins of the Crazy Horse Name and Proliferation of Third Party Uses of Crazy Horse

8. In 1951, Alain Bernardin opened Le Crazy Horse in Paris, France. Also known
5 as Le Crazy Horse Saloon or Le Crazy Horse de Paris, the Parisian cabaret featured racy
6 burlesque routines performed by nude female dancers. In the over 50 years since it opened, Le
7 Crazy Horse has become world renown and been featured in several documentaries.

9. Not surprisingly, the success and notoriety of Le Crazy Horse spawned a
10 multitude of CRAZY HORSE gentlemen's clubs, restaurants, night clubs, saloons, and taverns
11 across the United States and the world. These countless clubs are not owned or licensed by the
12 original Le Crazy Horse in Paris; rather, they are owned and operated by independent and
13 unaffiliated third parties. In fact, it is quite likely that a CRAZY HORSE gentlemen's club,
14 night club, or restaurant/bar can be found in just about every major city in the United States.

15. In trademark law, when numerous identical or similar marks permeate the
16 marketplace, such marks exist in what is called a "crowded field." In a crowded field, a mark
17 has very little commercial strength (i.e., actual marketplace recognition). Therefore, in a
18 crowded field, each member is weak in its ability to prevent use by others in the crowd. In light
19 of the number of CRAZY HORSE marks permeating the marketplace, it is clear that CRAZY
20 HORSE is part of a crowded field.

The Use of Crazy Horse in Las Vegas and Plaintiff's Use of the CRAZY HORSE III Mark

21. There is a long and storied history surrounding the use of the CRAZY HORSE
22 name and mark in Las Vegas, Nevada. Based upon information and belief, during the late 1970s
23 / early 1980s, Jack Galardi opened the original Crazy Horse Saloon club on Paradise Road in
24 Las Vegas, which eventually closed in the late 1980s.

1 12. Shortly after the closure of the original Crazy Horse Saloon, the Crazy Horse Too
2 gentlemen's club opened at 2466 Industrial Road in Las Vegas. As its name implies, Crazy
3 Horse Too was patterned after the Crazy Horse Saloon on Paradise Road. Following the well-
4 publicized legal difficulties of its owner, the Crazy Horse Too club closed its doors on
5 September 7, 2006.

6 13. About three years later, on or about September 4, 2009, Russell Road opened a
7 gentlemen's club under the CRAZY HORSE III name in the Playground complex, a 40,000
8 square foot complex in Las Vegas that features 24-hour attractions, including nightclubs, dining
9 establishments, live music, and live sports viewing. The club is located at 3525 West Russell
10 Road.

11 14. Russell Road uses the CRAZY HORSE III name and mark primarily as part of a
12 design logo that features three horses and the words CRAZY HORSE III GENTLEMEN'S
13 CLUB:  (hereinafter referred to as the "CRAZY HORSE III Design Mark").

14 15. In this regard, Russell Road owns two trademark registrations issued by the State
15 of Nevada for its CRAZY HORSE III Design Mark in connection with the "operation of an adult
16 entertainment facility." The registrations were issued on June 15 2010.

17 16. In addition, Russell Road owns a pending federal trademark application for its
18 CRAZY HORSE III Design Mark, namely, U.S. Trademark Application Serial No. 85/584,958
19 for "entertainment services, namely, live performances by dancers; night clubs."

20 17. Since opening its CRAZY HORSE III club nearly three years ago, Russell Road
21 has not experienced any actual confusion arising out of its use of the CRAZY HORSE III name
22 and mark. No customers or other third parties have ever inquired about any sponsorship,
23 affiliation, or other relationship between Russell Road and Defendants.

BROWN BROWN & PREMSRIRUT
520 South 4th Street | Second Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Tel: (702) 384-5563 Fax: (702) 385-1752

Defendants' Use of CRAZY HORSE and Sudden Enforcement and Franchising Efforts

1 18. Frank Spencer is an individual in Ohio who claims to own nationwide rights to
2 the CRAZY HORSE trademark for gentlemen's clubs. However, based upon information and
3 strong belief, Frank Spencer individually does not own any gentlemen's clubs at all and,
4 accordingly does not own any rights to the CRAZY HORSE mark. In this regard, Frank
5 Spencer has incorporated or is otherwise associated with the following numerous corporations
6 that are connected with gentlemen's clubs that Frank Spencer claims to own: : Jozac
7 Corporation, Grand American Management Corporation, Crazy Horse Consulting, Inc., Crazy
8 Horse Management, Inc., Lake Food & Beverage, Inc., Almi Corp., and Parkbrook
9 Entertainment, Inc. It is believed that one or more of these entities is the real owner of any
10 gentlemen's club associated with Frank Spencer. There are likely several other entities.

11 19. One of the companies with which Frank Spencer is associated owns and operates
12 three gentlemen's clubs in Ohio under the CRAZY HORSE name located in Cleveland, Ohio;
13 Bedford Ohio; and Brook Park, Ohio. There is no indication that Frank Spencer, or the
14 companies that he is associated with, own and operate any gentlemen's clubs outside of Ohio.

15 20. On information and belief, Frank Spencer is a member of the Association of Club
16 Executives and intimately involved in the adult entertainment industry. By and through this
17 membership, Frank Spencer unequivocally has knowledge that the CRAZY HORSE trademark
18 has been widely adopted by numerous third parties for a wide variety of goods and services,
19 including but not limited to gentlemen's clubs.

20 21. Nevertheless, and in derogation of the already existing marks in use prior to
21 Mr. Spencer's application, Frank Spencer proceeded to file two federal trademark applications
22 with the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") for the CRAZY HORSE
23 trademark, U.S. Application Serial No. 77/557,722 and U.S. Application Serial No. 85/217,717.
24 Despite the fact that the true trademark owner was one of the companies he is associated with

(most likely Jozac Corporation), Frank Spencer filed the trademark application in his own personal name. Despite the fact that any use of the CRAZY HORSE mark by Spencer had been limited to intrastate uses in Ohio, Frank Spencer declared under oath that he had used the mark in interstate commerce (i.e., across state lines). And despite the fact that he was fully aware of third party uses of CRAZY HORSE, he declared under oath that no one else had the right to use the CRAZY HORSE trademark in commerce in identical or in such near resemblance. These false and fraudulent statements are sufficient grounds to find U.S. Application Serial Nos. 77/557,722 and 85/217,717 void and unenforceable.

22. Upon examination, the USPTO refused registration of Frank Spencer's applications to register CRAZY HORSE based on U.S. Trademark Registration No. 3,044,028 for CRAZY HORSE, owned by an individual named Carl Reid in South Carolina.

23. As a result of the USPTO's refusal to register his applications, Frank Spencer proceeded to orchestrate an assignment of U.S. Trademark Registration No. 3,044,028 from Carl Reid to Crazy Horse Consulting, Inc., one of Frank Spencer's companies. The assignment was dated December 10, 2010, and recorded with the USPTO on January 11, 2011.

24. Notably, before assigning U.S. Trademark Registration No. 3,044,028 to Crazy Horse Consulting, Carl Reid had executed a Trademark Co-Existence Agreement with Crazy Horse Too A Gentlemen's Club, a Nevada limited liability company. In the co-existence agreement, Carl Reid expressly conceded that there was no likelihood of confusion between the marks CRAZY HORSE TOO and CRAZY HORSE. In addition, the consent agreement permitted Crazy Horse Too A Gentlemen's Club to adopt, use, and register any mark containing CRAZY HORSE so long as it did not include the words PURE GOLD'S. Any rights acquired in U.S. Trademark Registration No. 3,044,028 by Crazy Horse Consulting by way of the assignment are subject to and limited by this co-existence agreement, whether in law or equity.

1 25. Furthermore, Crazy Horse Too a Gentlemen's Club has assigned its rights under
2 the Trademark Co-Existence Agreement with Carl Reid to Russell Road. As a result, pursuant
3 to the terms of the Trademark Co-Existence Agreement, Russell Road has the contractual right
4 to use its CRAZY HORSE III mark and CRAZY HORSE III Design Mark since those marks do
5 not include the phrase PURE GOLD'S. Defendants, as the assignees of Carl Reid's U.S.
6 Trademark Registration No. 3,044,028, are bound by the Trademark Co-Existence Agreement
7 and the consent provided therein to allow Russell Road (the contractual successor to Crazy
8 Horse Too A Gentlemen's Club) to adopt, use, and register any mark containing CRAZY
9 HORSE so long as it did not include the words PURE GOLD'S.

10 26. On January 26, 2012, subsequent to the assignment of U.S. Trademark
11 Registration No. 3,044,028 to Crazy Horse Consulting, Frank Spencer, Crazy Horse Consulting,
12 and JAT Investments, LLC (an entity owned or associated with Carl Reid) entered into a consent
13 agreement in which they consented to their respective uses of the CRAZY HORSE marks and
14 conceded that there was no likelihood of confusion as a result of their concurrent uses of the
15 CRAZY HORSE marks. Defendants' rights, if any, in the CRAZY HORSE mark are subject to
16 and limited by this consent agreement, whether in law or equity.

17 27. Having orchestrated the assignment of U.S. Trademark Registration No.
18 3,044,028 for CRAZY HORSE to Crazy Horse Consulting, Frank Spencer has improperly been
19 trying to appropriate the CRAZY HORSE mark for himself and/or the companies that he is
20 associated with seeking an unfair advantage over pre-existing businesses and uses. Despite the
21 fact that a crowded field has existed for decades for the CRAZY HORSE mark in connection
22 with not only gentlemen's clubs, but a wide variety of goods and services, Frank Spencer has
23 been contacting third parties who use the CRAZY HORSE name or mark and demanding that
24 they enter into a licensing or franchising arrangement with Crazy Horse Consulting. In fact,
25 Defendants' own website admits the existence of a crowded field and admits that Defendants are
26
27
28

1 not the true owners of the CRAZY HORSE name: “The Crazy Horse name, which has been
2 unavailable for the last 30 years has now gone to its rightful and earliest user, C.H.C. Inc. [Crazy
3 Horse Consulting]” In any event, Defendants’ ill-conceived attempts to unring the bell and
4 futilely attempt to put an end to decades of a crowded field of CRAZY HOSE marks by making
5 trademark infringement threats in order to profit from some haphazard franchising scheme
6 should be rejected by this Court.
7

History and Current Status of the Trademark Dispute Between Plaintiff and Defendants

8 28. On information and belief, Frank Spencer traveled to Las Vegas to attend the
9 Gentlemen’s Club Owners Expo that was held August 21–24, 2011. While attending the
10 Gentlemen’s Club Owners Expo, Frank Spencer became aware of Russell Road’s CRAZY
11 HORSE III gentlemen’s club and may have actually visited the club in person.
12

13 29. Once he became aware of Russell Road’s CRAZY HORSE III gentlemen’s club,
14 Frank Spencer began inquiring about the club and its owners. At one point, Frank Spencer
15 called the club and asked to speak to Nando Sostilio, one of the principals of Russell Road. Mr.
16 Sostilio was unavailable at the time, and the message was relayed to Bob Lenson, another
17 representative of Russell Road.
18

19 30. Mr. Lenson returned the call and spoke briefly to Frank Spencer. During the call,
20 Frank Spencer asserted that he owned the rights to the CRAZY HORSE trademark, that Russell
21 Road’s use of the CRAZY HORSE III trademark infringed his rights, and that Russell Road
22 needed a license to continue to use the CRAZY HORSE III mark. Mr. Lenson disagreed with
23 the assertions and referred Frank Spencer to Martin Pomeroy, Russell Road’s counsel.
24

25 31. On February 8, 2012, Frank Spencer sent email correspondence to Russell Road’s
26 counsel Martin Pomeroy demanding that Russell Road complete and return an application form
27 to license the CRAZY HORSE trademark from Defendants. Attached as Exhibit A is a true and
28

1 correct copy of the application form that Defendants demanded Russell Road complete and
2 return.

3 32. On April 12, 2012, Russell Road, through its counsel, sent a response letter to
4 Defendants disputing Defendants' contention that Russell Road needed any license from
5 Defendants in order to use its CRAZY HORSE III Design Mark. In the letter, Russell Road
6 clearly articulates why it does not infringe Defendant's claimed trademark rights in the CRAZY
7 HORSE mark

8 33. On May 17, 2012, Frank Spencer and Crazy Horse Consulting responded through
9 their counsel, Jay Moldovanyi of Fay Sharpe LLP reiterating their mistaken belief that Russell
10 Road's use of its CRAZY HORSE III trademark infringed Defendants' claimed rights in the
11 CRAZY HORSE mark and proceeded to put Russell Road on notice that Defendants intended to
12 oppose Russell Road's U.S. Trademark Application Serial No. 85/584,958 for the CRAZY
13 HORSE III GENTLEMEN'S CLUB design mark. Defendants further claimed that Las Vegas
14 was a major market for them and that they would take whatever steps are necessary to enforce
15 their rights in that locale. Attached as Exhibit B is a true and correct copy of the May 17, 2012
16 letter from Defendants' counsel.

17 34. As a result of Defendants' foregoing acts and threats of trademark infringements,
18 Russell Road has a real and reasonable apprehension that Defendants will file a lawsuit for
19 trademark infringement, and Russell Road requires this Court to resolve the parties' dispute so
20 that Russell Road is not forced to choose between foregoing its current use of the CRAZY
21 HORSE III Design Mark and risking future damages and harm to the relationship between
22 Russell Road and its customers.

BROWN BROWN & PREMSRIRUT
520 South 4th Street | Second Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Tel: (702) 384-5563 Fax: (702) 385-1752

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

OF NON-INFRINGEMENT OF TRADEMARK (15 U.S.C. § 1051 *et seq.*)

35. Paragraphs 1–34, above, are realleged and incorporated by reference as if set forth in full.

36. Defendants claim to own trademark rights in the CRAZY HORSE mark and claim that Russell Road's use of its CRAZY HORSE III Design Mark infringes their rights.

37. Russell Road disputes (1) that Defendants have priority of rights in the CRAZY HORSE mark (at least in Las Vegas and the State of Nevada) and (2) that there is any likelihood of confusion as a result of the parties' respective uses of their CRAZY HORSE marks.

38. With regard to priority, Russell Road incorporates by reference the remaining claims for relief alleged in this Complaint, which detail the defects in Defendants' claimed ownership of federal applications and a federal registration for CRAZY HORSE. These applications provide the only basis for Defendants' claims of priority in the State of Nevada. However, as detailed in the remainder of this Complaint, Defendants' applications and registration are invalid, void, and unenforceable. As such, Defendants do not have priority in the CRAZY HORSE mark.

39. With regard to likelihood of confusion, as detailed in Paragraphs 9 and 10 of this Complaint, the CRAZY HORSE mark has been widely adopted and used by a multitude of third parties across the United States in connection with gentlemen's clubs, as well as a wide variety of related and unrelated goods and services. As a result, CRAZY HORSE marks exist as a part of a crowded field, and as a result, Defendants' do not have the ability as a matter of law to prevent Russell Road's use of the CRAZY HORSE III Design Mark.

1 40. Moreover, given this crowded field of CRAZY HORSE marks, the differences
2 between the parties' respective marks in terms of sight, sound, meaning, and overall commercial
3 impression are more than sufficient to obviate any likelihood of confusion

4 41. Not only are there visible differences between the parties' respective marks, but
5 there are also significant differences between the quality, price, and character of the parties'
6 respective goods/services, as well as significant differences between the parties' clientele, that
7 obviate any likelihood of confusion.

8 42. The lack of any likelihood of confusion is further evidenced by the fact that
9 parties have co-existed for at least three years without any instances of actual confusion.

10 43. In addition, Defendants' failure to police the CRAZY HORSE mark has led to
11 widespread usage by third parties and competitors of the CRAZY HORSE mark both for
12 gentlemen's clubs, as well as a wide variety of related and unrelated goods and services.
13 Defendants' failure to police the CRAZY HORSE mark has resulted in the effective
14 abandonment of the mark by Defendants.

15 44. Likewise, to the extent Defendants have been licensing the CRAZY HORSE
16 mark to third parties, on information and belief, such licensing has lacked adequate control over
17 the quality of the goods or services. Defendants' naked licensing and failure to exercise
18 appropriate control and supervision over its licensees has resulted in the effective abandonment
19 of the mark by Defendants.

20 45. Furthermore, Defendants are estopped from arguing that Russell Road's use of
21 the CRAZY HORSE III Design Mark infringes their claimed rights in CRAZY HORSE because
22 Defendants have (i) failed to actively police the CRAZY HORSE mark, (ii) have entered into
23 co-existence/consent agreements with third parties who use the CRAZY HORSE mark (i.e.,
24 marks that are as similar if not more similar than Russell Road's CRAZY HORSE III Design
25
26
27
28

1 Mark), and (iii) Defendants have gone on record with the USPTO that the addition of additional
2 terms to the words CRAZY HORSE is sufficient to preclude any likelihood of confusion.

3 46. By assignment, Russell Road is also party to a Trademark Co-Existence
4 Agreement in which Carl Reid, the prior owner of U.S. Trademark Registration No. 3,044,028,
5 consented to Russell Road's use of the CRAZY HORSE III mark and CRAZY HORSE III
6 Design Mark. Defendants, as the assignees of Carl Reid's U.S. Trademark Registration
7 No. 3,044,028, are bound by the Trademark Co-Existence Agreement and the consent provided
8 therein to allow Russell Road to adopt, use, and register any mark containing CRAZY HORSE
9 so long as it did not include the words PURE GOLD'S.

10 11 47. An actual, present, and justiciable controversy has arisen between Russell Road
12 and Defendants concerning Defendants' alleged rights in the CRAZY HORSE mark and
13 whether Russell Road is infringing Defendants' alleged trademark rights in the CRAZY HORSE
14 mark.

15 16 48. Russell Road seeks an order from this Court declaring that Russell Road's use of
17 both the CRAZY HORSE III mark and CRAZY HORSE III Design Mark do not infringe
18 Defendants' claimed rights in the CRAZY HORSE mark. In addition, Russell Road seek a
19 declaration from this Court that Russell Road is the assignee and successor to Crazy Horse Too
20 A Gentlemen's Club's rights under the Trademark Co-Existence Agreement and that Defendants
21 are bound by the consents given by Carl Reid in the Trademark Co-Existence Agreement.

22 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

23 **DECLARATORY JUDGMENT**

24 **OF UNENFORCEABILITY OF TRADEMARK (15 U.S.C. § 1051 *et seq.*)**

25 26 49. Paragraphs 1–48, above, are realleged and incorporated by reference as if set
forth in full.

27 28 50. Section 29 of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1111, permits the owner of a

1 registered trademark to use the registration symbol ®. However, if a mark has not been
2 registered with the USPTO, then the registration symbol may not be used—as such use would
3 deceive and mislead the public.

4 51. At least as early as August 28, 2008, Defendants were using the federal
5 registration symbol ® in connection with the CRAZY HORSE trademark. Defendants did not
6 own any trademark registrations at that time.
7

8 52. On information and belief, Defendants knew they did not own a federal
9 trademark registration at the time and used the federal registration symbol ® with the deliberate
10 intent to deceive and mislead the public and potential competitors.
11

12 53. An actual, present, and justiciable controversy has arisen between Russell Road
13 and Defendants concerning Defendants' alleged rights in the CRAZY HORSE mark and
14 whether Russell Road is infringing Defendants' alleged trademark rights in the CRAZY HORSE
15 mark.
16

17 54. Russell Road seeks an order from this Court declaring that Defendants' alleged
18 registered and unregistered rights in the CRAZY HORSE mark are unenforceable due to
19 Defendants' intentional and deceptive misuse of the registration symbol—whether such
20 enforceability stems from the doctrine of unclean hands, fraud, or otherwise.
21

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

TRADEMARK APPLICATIONS ARE VOID — NOT TRUE TRADEMARK OWNER

22 55. Paragraphs 1–54, above, are realleged and incorporated by reference as if set
23 forth in full.
24

25 56. Section 1 of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1051, requires that any trademark
26 application filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) be filed in the name of
27 the owner of the mark. This is a statutory requirement that cannot be waived. The requirement
28

1 has been upheld in numerous federal cases. In addition, the Trademark Manual of Examining
2 Procedure (“TMEP”), which sets forth the current law, practices, and procedures used by the
3 examining attorneys at the USPTO, makes this requirement clear as well.

4 57. If a trademark application is filed in the name of an applicant who was not the
5 owner of the mark at the time the application was filed, the application is void. 37 CFR
6 § 2.71(d); TMEP § 803.01. Furthermore, the mistake cannot be corrected, even if the mistake
7 was unintentionally and innocently made.

8 58. On August 28, 2008, Frank Spencer filed U.S. Application Serial No. 77/557,722
9 for the CRAZY HORSE trademark in standard characters listing himself as the owner and
10 applicant.

11 59. On January 14, 2011, Frank Spencer filed U.S. Application Serial No. 85/217,717
12 for the CRAZY HORSE trademark in standard characters listing himself as the owner and
13 applicant.

14 60. On information and belief, Frank Spencer was not the true trademark owner at the
15 time he filed U.S. Application Serial Nos. 77/557,722 and 85/217,717. Rather, the proper
16 applicant and trademark owner was one or more of the numerous corporations owned and/or
17 used by Frank Spencer and/or his business associates. From the Ohio Secretary of State’s
18 corporate records, it appears that Frank Spencer incorporated a corporation named Jozac
19 Corporation. On January 19, 1994, Jozac Corporation filed both a trade name registration and a
20 fictitious name report for Crazy Horse Men’s Club with Ohio’s Secretary of State. These filings
21 occurred long before Frank Spencer filed U.S. Application Serial Nos. 77/557,722 and
22 85/217,717, evidencing that Frank Spencer was not the true trademark owner. Rather, it appears
23 that the applicant should have been listed as Jozac Corporation (or perhaps one of the other
24 numerous entities formed and used by Frank Spencer). As a result, pursuant to 37 CFR §
25 2.71(d), U.S. Application Serial Nos. 77/557,722 and 85/217,717 are void.
26
27
28

1 61. An actual, present, and justiciable controversy has arisen between Russell Road
 2 and Frank Spencer concerning Frank Spencer's alleged rights in the CRAZY HORSE mark, the
 3 validity and enforceability of U.S. Application Serial Nos. 77/557,722 and 85/217,717, and
 4 whether Russell Road is infringing Frank Spencer's alleged trademark rights in the CRAZY
 5 HORSE mark.

6 62. Russell Road seeks an order from this Court declaring that U.S. Application
 7 Serial Nos. 77/557,722 and 85/217,717 are void and unenforceable because the true trademark
 8 owner was not listed as the applicant at the time each application was filed.
 9

10 **FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

11 **DECLARATORY JUDGMENT**

12 **FRAUD ON THE USPTO – NO INTERSTATE COMMERCE USE**

13 63. Paragraphs 1–62, above, are realleged and incorporated by reference as if set
 14 forth in full.

15 64. Russell Road owns and operates a gentlemen's club under the CRAZY HORSE
 16 III Design Mark. Frank Spencer claims that Russell Road is infringing his claimed rights in the
 17 CRAZY HORSE mark and U.S. Trademark Application Serial Nos. 77/557,722 and 85/217,717.
 18 As such, Russell Road will be damaged by the registration on the Principal Register of U.S.
 19 Trademark Application Serial Nos. 77/557,722 and 85/217,717.

20 65. On August 28, 2008, Frank Spencer filed U.S. Application Serial No. 77/557,722
 21 for the CRAZY HORSE trademark in standard characters. The application was filed based on
 22 use in interstate commerce pursuant to § 1 of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1051(a). As part of
 23 the application, Frank Spencer executed a declaration alleging under oath that he first used the
 24 CRAZY HORSE trademark in interstate commerce at least as early as 1978.

25 66. On January 14, 2011, Frank Spencer filed U.S. Application Serial No. 85/217,717
 26 for the CRAZY HORSE trademark in standard characters. The application was filed based on

1 use in interstate commerce pursuant to § 1 of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1051(a). As part of
2 the application, Frank Spencer executed a declaration alleging under oath that he first used the
3 CRAZY HORSE trademark in interstate commerce at least as early as August 31, 1978.

4 67. On information and belief, Frank Spencer's representations under oath in both
5 applications that he first used the CRAZY HORSE trademark in interstate commerce at least as
6 early as 1978 was false. Frank Spencer did not use the CRAZY HORSE mark in interstate
7 commerce as early as 1978 or as of the filing date of the applications. Rather, it appears that the
8 use of the CRAZY HORSE trademark was limited to a purely intrastate use in Ohio where Jozac
9 Corporation owned and operated one or more gentlemen's clubs.
10

11 68. The false representations of use in interstate commerce as early as 1978 were
12 material. In this regard, an application filed with the USPTO cannot register until it has been
13 used in interstate commerce. As such, the USPTO relied on the false representations.
14

15 69. Frank Spencer had knowledge of the falsity of the representation—*i.e.*, Frank
16 Spencer knew that he had not used the CRAZY HORSE trademark in interstate commerce as
17 early as 1978 or as of the filing dates of the applications.
18

19 70. Frank Spencer made the false representation with the intent to deceive the
20 USPTO to obtain trademark registrations for the CRAZY HORSE mark.
21

22 71. An actual, present, and justiciable controversy has arisen between Russell Road
23 and Frank Spencer concerning Frank Spencer's alleged rights in the CRAZY HORSE mark, the
24 validity and enforceability of U.S. Application Serial Nos. 77/557,722 and 85/217,717, and
25 whether Russell Road is infringing Frank Spencer's alleged trademark rights in the CRAZY
HORSE mark.
26

27 72. Russell Road seeks a declaration from this Court that Frank Spencer committed
28 fraud on the USPTO by submitting fraudulent representations of use in interstate commerce at
least as early as 1978 and an order instructing the USPTO to abandon U.S. Trademark

1 Application Serial Nos. 77/557,722 and 85/217,717.

2 **FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

3 **DECLARATORY JUDGMENT**

4 **FRAUD ON THE USPTO – NO EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS**

5 73. Paragraphs 1–71, above, are realleged and incorporated by reference as if set
6 forth in full.

7 74. Russell Road owns and operates a gentlemen's club under the CRAZY HORSE
8 III Design Mark. Frank Spencer claims that Russell Road is infringing his claimed rights in the
9 CRAZY HORSE mark and U.S. Trademark Application Serial Nos. 77/557,722 and 85/217,717.
10 As such, Russell Road will be damaged by the registration on the Principal Register of U.S.
11 Trademark Application Serial Nos. 77/557,722 and 85/217,717.

12 75. On August 28, 2008, Frank Spencer filed U.S. Application Serial No. 77/557,722
13 for the CRAZY HORSE trademark in standard characters. The application was filed based on
14 use in interstate commerce pursuant to § 1 of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1051(a).

15 76. On January 14, 2011, Frank Spencer filed U.S. Application Serial No. 85/217,717
16 for the CRAZY HORSE trademark in standard characters. The application was filed based on
17 use in interstate commerce pursuant to § 1 of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1051(a).

18 77. As part of both applications, Frank Spencer executed a declaration alleging under
19 oath that “no other person, firm, corporation, or association has the right to use the mark in
20 commerce, either in the identical form thereof or in such near resemblance thereto as to be
21 likely, when used on or in connection with the goods or services of such person, to cause
22 confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive.”

23 78. Frank Spencer's representation under oath that no one else had the right to use the
24 CRAZY HORSE trademark in commerce in identical or in such near resemblance was false. As
25 an alleged owner of a gentlemen's club and someone intimately involved in the adult

1 entertainment industry, Frank Spencer was aware of numerous third party CRAZY HORSE
2 gentlemen's clubs existing across the United States and world. Many of these clearly predated
3 the filing date of U.S. Trademark Application Serial Nos. 77/557,722 and 85/217,717.

4 79. The false representation that no one else had the right to use the CRAZY HORSE
5 trademark in commerce in identical or in such near resemblance was material. In this regard, an
6 application filed with the USPTO cannot register until an applicant provides such a verified
7 statement, as these are statutory requirement of Section 1(a)(3) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C.
8 § 1051(a)(3), and 37 CFR § 2.33(b)(1). As such, the USPTO relied on the false representation
9 in accepting the applications for examination and, were it not for the falsity of the representation,
10 would not have done so.

12 80. Frank Spencer had knowledge of the falsity of the representations—*i.e.*, Frank
13 Spencer knew that numerous third party CRAZY HORSE gentlemen's clubs existing across the
14 United States and world and that these third parties were entitled to use the CRAZY HORSE
15 mark.

17 81. Frank Spencer made the false representations with the intent to deceive the
18 USPTO to obtain trademark registrations for the CRAZY HORSE mark.

19 82. An actual, present, and justiciable controversy has arisen between Russell Road
20 and Frank Spencer concerning Frank Spencer's alleged rights in the CRAZY HORSE mark, the
21 validity and enforceability of U.S. Application Serial Nos. 77/557,722 and 85/217,717, and
22 whether Russell Road is infringing Frank Spencer's alleged trademark rights in the CRAZY
23 HORSE mark

25 83. Russell Road seeks a declaration from this Court that Frank Spencer committed
26 fraud on the USPTO by submitting fraudulent representations that no one else had the right to
27 use the CRAZY HORSE trademark in commerce and an order instructing the USPTO to
28 abandon U.S. Trademark Application Serial Nos. 77/557,722 and 85/217,717.

BROWN BROWN & PREMSRIRUT
520 South 4th Street | Second Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Tel: (702) 384-5563 Fax: (702) 385-1752

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

CANCELLATION OF U.S. TRADEMARK REGISTRATION NO. 3,044,028

FRAUD ON THE USPTO – NO INTERSTATE COMMERCE USE

4 84. Paragraphs 1–82, above, are realleged and incorporated by reference as if set
 5 forth in full.

6 85. Russell Road owns and operates a gentlemen's club under the CRAZY HORSE
 7 III Design Mark. Crazy Horse Consulting, the owner of U.S. Trademark Registration No.
 8 3,044,028 by assignment, claims that Russell Road is infringing its claimed rights in the
 9 CRAZY HORSE mark and U.S. Trademark Registration No. 3,044,028. As such, Russell Road
 10 is being damaged and will be damaged by the continued registration on the Principal Register of
 11 U.S. Trademark Registration No. 3,044,028 and, therefore, seeks cancellation of the registration.

12 86. On November 18, 2004, Carl Reid filed U.S. Application Serial No. 76/621,471
 13 for the CRAZY HORSE trademark in connection with “entertainment services, namely, exotic
 14 dance performances.” The applications was filed based on use in interstate commerce pursuant
 15 to § 1 of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1051(a).

16 87. As part of the application, Carl Reid executed a declaration alleging under oath
 17 that he first used the CRAZY HORSE trademark in interstate commerce at least as early as
 18 January 21, 2001.

19 88. On information and belief, Carl Reid's representation under oath that he first used
 20 the CRAZY HORSE trademark in interstate commerce at least as early as January 21, 2001 was
 21 false. Carl Reid did not use the CRAZY HORSE mark in interstate commerce as of January 21,
 22 2001 or as of November 18, 2004, the filing date of the application. Rather, it appears that the
 23 use of the CRAZY HORSE trademark was limited to a purely intrastate use in South Carolina
 24 where Crazy Horse Saloon and Restaurant, Inc. owned and operated a single gentlemen's club.

25 89. The false representation of use in interstate commerce as early as January 21,

2001 was material to the registrability of the mark. In this regard, an application filed with the USPTO cannot register until it has been used in interstate commerce. As such, the USPTO relied on the false representation in issuing U.S. Trademark Registration No. 3,044,028 and, were it not for the falsity of the representation, would not have issued the registration.

90. Carl Reid had knowledge of the falsity of the representation—*i.e.*, Carl Reid knew that he had not used the CRAZY HORSE trademark in interstate commerce as early as January 21, 2001.

91. Carl Reid made the false representation with the intent to deceive the USPTO to obtain a trademark registration for the CRAZY HORSE mark.

92. Russell Road seeks an order from this Court instructing the USPTO to cancel U.S. Registration No. 3,044,028 based on Carl Reid's fraudulent representation of use in interstate commerce at least as early as January 21, 2001.

SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

CANCELLATION OF U.S. TRADEMARK REGISTRATION NO. 3,044,028

FRAUD ON THE USPTO – NOT TRUE TRADEMARK OWNER

93. Paragraphs 1–89, above, are realleged and incorporated by reference as if set forth in full.

94. Russell Road owns and operates a gentlemen's club under the CRAZY HORSE III Design Mark. Crazy Horse Consulting, the owner of U.S. Trademark Registration No. 3,044,028 by assignment, claims that Russell Road is infringing its claimed rights in the CRAZY HORSE mark and U.S. Trademark Registration No. 3,044,028. As such, Russell Road is being damaged and will be damaged by the continued registration on the Principal Register of U.S. Trademark Registration No. 3,044,028 and, therefore, seeks cancellation of the registration.

95. On November 18, 2004, Carl Reid filed U.S. Application Serial No. 76/621,471

1 for the CRAZY HORSE trademark in connection with “entertainment services, namely, exotic
2 dance performances.” The applications was filed based on use in interstate commerce pursuant
3 to § 1 of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1051(a).

4 96. As part of the application, Carl Reid executed a declaration alleging under oath
5 that “he is the owner of the trademark sought to be registered.”

6 97. On information and belief, Carl Reid’s representation under oath that he was the
7 owner of the CRAZY HORSE trademark was false. On information and belief, Carl Reid was
8 not the true trademark owner at the time he filed U.S. Application Serial No 76/621,471.
9 Rather, the proper applicant and trademark owner was one or more of the numerous corporations
10 owned and/or used by Carl Reid and/or his business associates. From the South Carolina
11 Secretary of State’s corporate records, it appears that Carl Reid incorporated a corporation
12 named Crazy Horse Saloon and Restaurant, Inc. The corporation was formed on September 13,
13 1988 and uses the same address that Carl Reid used for the Crazy Horse club in South Carolina.
14 The formation of the company occurred long before Carl Reid filed U.S. Application Serial No.
15 76/621,471, evidencing that Carl Reid was not the true trademark owner. Rather, it appears that
16 the applicant should have been listed as Crazy Horse Saloon and Restaurant, Inc. (or perhaps one
17 of the other numerous entities formed and used by Carl Reid). As a result, pursuant to 37 CFR §
18 2.71(d), U.S. Application Serial No. 76/621,471 is void.

19 98. The false representation that Carl Reid was the owner of the CRAZY HORSE
20 trademark was material to the registrability of the mark. Section 1 of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C.
21 § 1051, requires that any trademark application filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
22 (“USPTO”) be filed in the name of the owner of the mark. This is a statutory requirement that
23 cannot be waived. The requirement has been upheld in numerous federal cases. In addition, the
24 Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure (“TMEP”), which sets forth the current law,
25 practices, and procedures used by the examining attorneys at the USPTO, makes this
26
27
28

1 requirement clear as well. If a trademark application is filed in the name of an applicant who
 2 was not the owner of the mark at the time the application was filed, the application is void. 37
 3 CFR § 2.71(d); TMEP § 803.01. Furthermore, the mistake cannot be corrected, even if the
 4 mistake was unintentionally and innocently made. As such, the USPTO relied on the false
 5 representation of ownership in issuing U.S. Trademark Registration No. 3,044,028 and, were it
 6 not for the falsity of the representation, would not have issued the registration.
 7

8 99. Carl Reid had knowledge of the falsity of the representation—*i.e.*, Carl Reid
 9 knew that he was not the true owner of the CRAZY HORSE trademark when he filed the
 10 application.

11 100. Carl Reid made the false representation with the intent to deceive the USPTO to
 12 obtain a trademark registration for the CRAZY HORSE mark.

13 101. Russell Road seeks an order from this Court instructing the USPTO to cancel
 14 U.S. Registration No. 3,044,028 based on Carl Reid’s fraudulent representation of ownership
 15 and because the registration is void pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 2.71(d).

EIGHTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

CANCELLATION OF U.S. TRADEMARK REGISTRATION NO. 3,044,028

FRAUD ON THE USPTO – NO EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS

19 202. Paragraphs 1–98, above, are realleged and incorporated by reference as if set
 21 forth in full.

22 103. Russell Road owns and operates a gentlemen’s club under the CRAZY HORSE
 23 III Design Mark. Crazy Horse Consulting, the owner of U.S. Trademark Registration No.
 24 3,044,028 by assignment, claims that Russell Road is infringing its claimed rights in the
 25 CRAZY HORSE mark and U.S. Trademark Registration No. 3,044,028. As such, Russell Road
 26 is being damaged and will be damaged by the continued registration on the Principal Register of
 27 U.S. Trademark Registration No. 3,044,028 and, therefore, seeks cancellation of the registration.
 28

1 104. On November 18, 2004, Carl Reid filed U.S. Application Serial No. 76/621,471
 2 for the CRAZY HORSE trademark in connection with “entertainment services, namely, exotic
 3 dance performances.” The applications was filed based on use in interstate commerce pursuant
 4 to § 1 of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1051(a).

5 105. As part of the application, Carl Reid executed a declaration alleging under oath
 6 that “no other person, firm, corporation, or association has the right to use the mark in
 7 commerce, either in the identical form thereof or in such near resemblance thereto as to be
 8 likely, when used on or in connection with the goods or services of such person, to cause
 9 confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive.”

10 106. Carl Reid’s representation under oath that no one else had the right to use the
 11 CRAZY HORSE trademark in commerce in identical or in such near resemblance was false. As
 12 an alleged owner of a gentlemen’s club, Carl Reid was aware of numerous third party CRAZY
 13 HORSE gentlemen’s clubs existing across the United States and world. Many of these clearly
 14 predated any alleged use by Carl Reid or his companies.

15 107. The false representation that no one else had the right to use the CRAZY HORSE
 16 trademark in commerce in identical or in such near resemblance was material to the registrability
 17 of the mark. In this regard, an application filed with the USPTO cannot register until an
 18 applicant provides such a verified statement, as these are statutory requirement of Section
 19 1(a)(3) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1051(a)(3), and 37 CFR § 2.33(b)(1). As such, the
 20 USPTO relied on the false representation in issuing U.S. Trademark Registration No. 3,044,028
 21 and, were it not for the falsity of the representation, would not have issued the registration.

22 108. Carl Reid had knowledge of the falsity of the representation—*i.e.*, Carl Reid
 23 knew that numerous third party CRAZY HORSE gentlemen’s clubs existing across the United
 24 States and world and that these third parties were entitled to use the CRAZY HORSE mark.

25 109. Carl Reid made the false representation with the intent to deceive the USPTO to

obtain a trademark registration for the CRAZY HORSE mark.

110. Russell Road seeks an order from this Court instructing the USPTO to cancel U.S. Registration No. 3,044,028 based on Carl Reid's fraudulent representation that no one else had the right to use the CRAZY HORSE trademark in commerce.

PRAAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Russell Road prays for judgment against Frank Spencer and Crazy Horse Consulting and relief as follows:

- (i) that the Court declare that Russell Road use of its CRAZY HORSE III trademark does not infringe any of Frank Spencer's and/or Crazy Horse Consulting's registered or unregistered trademark rights;
 - (ii) that the Court declare that Russell Road is the assignee and successor to Crazy Horse Too A Gentlemen's Club's rights under the Trademark Co-Existence Agreement and that Defendants are bound by the Trademark Co-Existence Agreement and the consents given by Carl Reid in the agreement;
 - (iii) that the Court declare that Frank Spencer's and/or Crazy Horse Consulting's registered and unregistered rights in the CRAZY HORSE trademark unenforceable and abandoned;
 - (iv) that the Court declare U.S. Application Serial Nos. 77/557,722 and 85/217,717 void and unenforceable;
 - (v) that the Court declare U.S. Trademark Registration No. 3,044,028 void and unenforceable;
 - (vi) that the Court order that U.S. Trademark Registration No. 3,044,028 be cancelled;
 - (vii) that Russell Road be awarded its costs and attorneys' fees; and
 - (viii) such other and further relief that this Court may deem just and equitable.

1 DATED this 24th day of August, 2012.

2 BROWN BROWN & PREMSRIRUT

3
4 By: 
5 PUOY K. PREMSRIRUT, ESQ.

6 Nevada Bar #7141
7 520 S. Fourth St., Second Floor
8 Las Vegas, NV 89101

9
10 BRUNO W. TARABICHI,
11 CA Bar No. 215129
12 OWENS TARABICHI LLP
13 111 N. Market St., Suite 730
14 San Jose, California 95113
15 Telephone: 408.298.8200
16 Facsimile: 408.521.2203
17 Pro Hac Vice Application Pending
18 Attorneys for Plaintiff
19 Russell Road Food and Beverage, LLC

BROWN BROWN & PREMSRIRUT
520 South 4th Street | Second Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Tel: (702) 384-5563 Fax: (702) 385-1752

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff demands a jury trial.

DATED this 24th day of August, 2012.

BROWN BROWN & PREMSRIRUT

By: B Kpt
PUOY K. PREMSRIRUT, ESQ.
Nevada Bar #7141
520 S. Fourth St., Second Floor
Las Vegas, NV 89101

BRUNO W. TARABICHI,
CA Bar No. 215129
OWENS TARABICHI LLP
111 N. Market St., Suite 730
San Jose, California 95113
Telephone: 408.298.8200
Facsimile: 408.521.2203
Pro Hac Vice Application Pending
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Russell Road Food and Beverage, LLC

OWN BROWN & PREMSRIRUT
520 South 4th Street | Second Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Tel: (702) 384-5563 Fax: (702) 385-1752